UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,535	11/26/2003	Uwe Klinger	16104-015001 / 2003P00897	8674

32864 7590 02/11/2008

FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
LEE, JINHEE J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,535	KLINGER, UWE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jinhee J. Lee	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 November 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,16,17 and 21-61* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *23-59 and 61* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,16,17,21,22 and 60* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims 23-59 and 61 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 2/15/07. **A complete reply to this rejection must include a cancellation of nonelected claims** or other appropriate action since a final rejection was made on 10/3/07 (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-13, 16-17, 21-22, 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 60 recites the limitation as below:

"(1) if the server device has provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, the request instructing the server device to change the application program from the first state to a second state, generating the provided request to the server device in response to receiving the input and receiving at the client device and displaying in the browser a second application page provided by the server device in response to receiving the request;

(2) if the server device has not provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the

forward function for the first application page, not requesting a change to the first state in response to the input and continuing to display the first application page (inherent, in continuing to display, if no request is made)." This is confusing. In number (1), it is unclear as to who has provided a request, the server device or the client device. In number (2), it is confusing, because it says that there was a request for back or forward function, and then it says "not requesting a change." Is it requesting a back or forward function, which is a change? or is it not requesting a change, which is a contradiction to back, forward, or an input cited in claim 1 prior to this limitation? Clarify.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-13, 16-17, 21-22, 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slotznick (6011537).

Re claim 1 (as best understood), Slotznick discloses a method of providing navigation in a browser, the method comprising:

displaying a first application page in a browser on a client device, the first application page being received from a server device and relating to a first state of an

application program on the server device, the browser having a back function and a forward function (see column 18 lines 11-14 according to the numbering in the middle and column 37 lines 24-25 for example);

receiving an input from a user while the first application page is being displayed, the input requesting one of the back function and the forward function (see column 37 lines 24-25 for example); and

(1) if the server device has provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, the request instructing the server device to change the application program from the first state to a second state, generating the provided request to the server device in response to receiving the input and receiving at the client device and displaying in the browser a second application page provided by the server device in response to receiving the request (see abstract and column 18 lines 11-14 and column 37 lines 24-28 for example);

(2) if the server device has not provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, not requesting a change to the first state in response to the input and continuing to display the first application page (inherent, in continuing to display, if no request is made).

Re claim 2, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising loading at least one invisible page in the browser such that the first application page is visible in the

browser after the at least one invisible page has been loaded (see column 15 lines 5-6, lines 14-20, lines 32-36 for example).

Re claim 3, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein loading the at least one invisible page comprises loading a first invisible page and then a second invisible page in the browser (different secondary information for example, see column 16 lines 15-18).

Re claim 4, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising again loading the first invisible page if the input requests the back function (column 17 lines 47 and lines 54-59 for example).

Re claim 5, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein again loading the first invisible page triggers generation of the request (column 15 lines 5-6, lines 14-20, lines 32-36 for example).

Re claim 6, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising storing information in a cookie on the client device to identify that the first invisible page is again being loaded in response to receiving the input requesting the back function (see column 15 lines 41-44, column 16 lines 29-33 for example).

Re claim 7, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising activating the back function after loading the second invisible page and again loading the first invisible page (column 17 lines 47, lines 54-59 for example).

Re claim 8, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising again loading the second invisible page if the input requests the forward function (column 37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 9, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein again loading the second invisible page triggers generation of the request (column 16 lines 15-20 and column 37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 10, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising storing information in a cookie on the client device to identify that the second invisible page is again being loaded in response to receiving the input requesting the forward function (column 15 lines 41-44, column 16 lines 29-33 for example).

Re claim 11, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising loading a third invisible page in the browser after loading the second invisible page and activating the back function after loading the third invisible page and again loading the second invisible page (column 16 lines 15-20 for example).

Re claim 12, Slotznick discloses a method, further comprising: again loading the first invisible page if the input requests the back function; and again loading the third invisible page if the input requests the forward function (column 16 lines 15-20, c37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 13, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein generation of the request is triggered by again loading one of the first and third invisible pages (column 16 lines 15-20 for example).

Re claim 16, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein the request comprises that a measure taken on the server device be undone (inherent function of forward and backward for example, see column 37 lines 24-25).

Re claim 17, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein the request comprises that a measure taken on the server device that has been undone should be redone (see column 37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 22, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein the application page is received from the server device in response to a request sent from the client device (column 18 lines 11-14 for example).

Re claim 60, Slotznick discloses a computer program product containing executable instructions that when executed cause a processor to perform operations comprising:

displaying a first application page in a browser on a client device, the first application page being received from a server device and relating to a first state of an application program on the server device (inherent), the browser having a back function and a forward function (see column 18 lines 11-14 and column 37 lines 24-25 for example);

receiving an input from a user while the first application page is being displayed, the input requesting one of the back function and the forward function (column 37 lines 24-25 for example); and

(1) if the server device has provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, the request instructing the server device to change the application program from the first state to a second state, generating the provided request to the server device in response to receiving the input and receiving at

the client device and displaying in the browser a second application page provided by the server device in response to receiving the request (see abstract and column 18 lines 11-14 and column 37 lines 24-28 for example);

(2) if the server device has not provided a request to be made by the client device to the server device regarding the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, not requesting a change to the first state in response to the input and continuing to display the first application page (inherent, in continuing to display, if no request is made).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slotznick in view of Li (7003695).

Re claim 21, Slotznick substantially discloses the method as set forth in claim 19 above. Slotznick does not explicitly disclose the method further comprising displaying a message to the user announcing one of an impossibility of undoing a measure taken on the server device and an impossibility of redoing a measure taken on the server device that has been undone. However, Li teaches of a method wherein an action further comprises displaying a message to the user announcing one of an impossibility of undoing a measure taken on the server device and an impossibility of redoing a

measure taken on the server device that has been undone (see claim 9 for example). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the message of Li on the method of Slotznick in order to provide clear message of inability of the program.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/07have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that Slotznick fails to disclose or suggest that a request changing an application state be specified by a server, examiner points out that the applicant's limitation states "server device has provided a **request to be made by the client device**". The claim is confusing however Slotznick does teach of request made by the client device as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinhee J. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1977. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F at 8:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-2100 ext. 74. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jinhee J Lee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

jjl